

PROBATION SERVICES TASK FORCE

SURVEY RESULTS

Part 1: Agency Staffing and Workload

Part 2: Probation Services

Part 3: Goals and Priorities of Probation Department

Part 4: Appointments, Evaluation & Terms Of Chief Probation Officer (CPO)

Part 5: Your Opinion about the Appointment System

The Probation Services Task Force (PSTF) determined, at their meeting on January 11-12, 2001, that a written report would be completed by Alan M. Schuman, Corrections Management Consulting, in preparation for the March 22-23, 2001 meeting in San Francisco. This report will include an analysis of Part 1: Agency Staffing and Workload, Part 2: Probation Services, and Part 3: Goals and Priorities of Probation Department. A written report on Part 4: Appointments, Evaluation & Terms of Chief Probation Officer (CPO), and Part 5: Your Opinion about the Appointment System, was completed and presented at the January 11-12, 2001 meeting.

A summary of responses on Parts 1-5 of the Stakeholder Survey is included on pages **58-59**.

In each of the fifty-eight counties the six stakeholder groups include:

- Board of Supervisors (BOS)/County Executive or Administrative Officer (CEO/CAO)
- Court Presiding Judge (PJ)/Court Administrator (CA)
- Chief Probation Officer (CPO)
- Probation Officer (PO)
- District Attorney (DA)
- Public Defender (PD)

A profile of responses for Parts 1-3 indicate that:

- There were **135 responses from 56 counties.**
- There was at least one response from 97 percent of the counties surveyed.
- The mix of counties by size and location is good.
- Eighteen counties responding have from one to five judges on the bench.
- Nineteen counties responding have from six to ten judges on the bench.
- Seven counties have eleven to twenty judges on the bench.
- Eleven counties have more than twenty judges on the bench.
- One county was unidentified.

Narrative survey responses were consolidated and grouped into appropriate categories.

PART 1: AGENCY STAFFING AND WORKLOAD

1. Total number of *authorized* Deputy Probation Officer or equivalent staff positions

- 41 counties responded
- Staff totals ranged from 2 to 487
- Data from 41 counties

<u>Positions</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ 1-10	7
▪ 11-20	5
▪ 21-50	8
▪ 51-100	7
▪ 101-200	7
▪ 201-300	2
▪ 301-400	4
▪ 400 +	1

- **Comments:** A high percentage of California’s probation departments are small to mid-size. Twenty-nine percent reported 20 or fewer staff. Forty-nine percent reported 50 or fewer staff. Sixty-six percent reported 100 or fewer staff.

1b. Total number of *vacant* probation department positions:

- Forty counties responded; one was invalid. Information from 40 counties follows.

<u>Vacancies</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ Zero	7
▪ 1-3%	10
▪ 4-5%	4
▪ 6%	2
▪ 7%	2
▪ 8%	5
▪ 9%	2
▪ 11%	2
▪ 13%	1
▪ 15%	1
▪ 16%	1
▪ 20%	2 (both small counties)
▪ 21%	1 (large county)

Comments: Probation departments appear to be doing a good job of keeping positions filled despite the movement of staff between counties or into other professions. Eighty percent of the counties reporting have fewer than 10% vacancies, and fifty-three percent have 5% or fewer vacancies.

2. Average *daily* number of *all* offenders under supervision by probation departments:

- Forty-one counties responded to this question

<u>Average</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ 500 or fewer	4
▪ 501 to 1,000	8
▪ 1,001 to 2,000	3
▪ 2,001 to 3,000	7
▪ 3,001 to 4,000	1
▪ 4,001 to 5,000	4
▪ 6,001 to 7,000	1
▪ 7,001 to 8,000	2
▪ 8,001 to 9,000	2
▪ 12,001 to 13,000	1
▪ 14,001 to 15,000	1
▪ 15,001 to 16,000	1
▪ 17,001 to 18,000	2
▪ 18,001 to 19,000	2
▪ 21,001 to 22,000	1
▪ 26,001 to 27,000	1

Comments: Twenty-nine percent of the 41 counties responding report 1,000 or fewer total juvenile and adult offenders on probation. Fifty-four percent have 3,000 or fewer. Fifteen percent have a combined juvenile and adult probation caseload of more than 17,000. Probation department size varies widely throughout the state. **A variety of solutions and strategies need to be considered when discussing the issues facing large, medium, and small probation departments.**

2a. Adult Probationers (misdemeanor-felony-total)

- Forty-one counties responded to this question.
- Four of the 41 reported only *total* probationer data.
- Thirty-three of the 37 responses (89%) had more felons than misdemeanors in their caseloads.
- Twenty-two or 59% of the caseloads have at least twice as many felon probationers.
- *Seven counties with total adult probation populations of at least 1,300 have **ten times more felony offenders as compared with misdemeanors.***
- There appears to be a higher percentage of felonies in the larger jurisdictions. Three of six counties with probation populations over 10,000 have more than **ten times** the felony offenders as compared with misdemeanors.

Comments: Adult misdemeanants are not a priority for probation services. This is directly related to the limited resources available for adult offenders. This approach is logical and reasonable. With limited resources, probation departments are choosing to focus on felons. **In reality, many felony charges that have been plea-bargained to misdemeanors. Is there really a difference between misdemeanor and felony adult probationers? Are we placing local communities at risk with minimal or no supervision for misdemeanants?**

2b. Juvenile probationers (misdemeanors-felons-total)

- Forty-one counties responded
- Fourteen of the 41 responses had only *total* juvenile probation numbers.
- **Thirteen of the 27 (48%) of the counties have more juvenile felons than misdemeanors compared to 89% for adults.**
- Only one small county has more than three times the number of juvenile felony offenders over misdemeanors.

Comments: A much higher percentage of juvenile probationers have misdemeanor charges as compared with adults. This is consistent with the discretion given to district attorneys to prosecute serious juvenile felony offenders in adult court. California has a

more amenable juvenile probation population to work with than many states that do not prosecute many of their serious juvenile felony offenders in adult court. Comprehensive services can have a major positive impact on California's juvenile population. Intensive services break the cycle of juvenile offender's progression into the adult system.

Many counties in California use the informal and prevention system that emphasizes prevention, diversion, and front-end services. This is an excellent community approach that maximizes available resources.

3. Daily average number of youths receiving in-house services

- Thirty-nine counties responded to this question.
- In-home services should represent a much higher number than out-of-home placement services. Some of the counties may have had a different definition for in-home services. Five counties reported having in-home services that account for only 6%, 44%, 11%, 4%, and 48% of the combined in-home and out-of-home total.
- Thirty-two counties reported having the following percentage breakdown of juvenile *in-home services*:

<u>% In-home service</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ 60-70%	2
▪ 71-80%	8
▪ 81-90%	16
▪ 91-100%	7

Comments: Twenty-three of 33 (70%) of counties responding report that 81-100% of juvenile probation services are in-home.

4. Daily average number of youths receiving out-of-home placement services

- There were a total of 41 counties responding. Two were not complete.
- It is not totally clear how out-of-home services are defined from the perspective of each county.

- Thirty-nine counties have the following percentage breakdown of juveniles in *out-of-home services*:

<u>% Out-of-home service</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ 2-5%	8
▪ 6-10%	13
▪ 11-15%	9
▪ 16-20%	5
▪ 21-25%	3
▪ 26-30%	1

Comments: Thirty of 39 counties (77%) report 15% or less receiving out-of-home services. **There does not appear to be any pattern of out-of-home service usage for small, medium or large counties. Only 10% report that more than 20% of their juvenile population receives out-of-home services.** It would be interesting to know if the out-of-home services have increased or decreased over the past five years given the probation department budget increases.

5. List the daily average population in all juvenile correctional facilities and their rated capacity

- Thirty-six counties responded with Juvenile Hall (JH) data.
- Four counties reported having more than one JH.
- Twenty-two of the 36 counties had data on juvenile correctional facilities (JCF).
- Eight counties reported on more than one JCF.

Juvenile Halls (JH)

- Twenty-three of the 36 counties responding (64%) have an average daily population that *exceeds* the rated capacity.
- Average daily population in JH's ranges from 2 to 580

- Average daily population in JH

<u>Population</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
▪ 0-20	6	17%
▪ 21-50	12	36%
▪ 51-100	4	11%
▪ 101-200	6	17%
▪ 201-300	2	5%
▪ 301-400	2	5%
▪ 401-500	2	5%
▪ 501-600	1	3%

Note: There were a total of 38 responses from 36 counties

Comments: Fifty-three percent of the counties reporting show a daily average of juvenile population of 50 or fewer. Forty-seven percent ranged from 50 to 580. **Eighteen percent of the Juvenile Hall facilities have a daily average over 200. These are potentially very difficult facilities to operate while providing appropriate program services, especially when almost two-thirds of these facilities exceed the rated capacity. This is a major issue raised by stakeholders at the six counties Alan Schuman visited in the summer of 2000. Many issues relating to Juvenile Halls need to be addressed as part of an overall plan to improve juvenile probation services.**

The warning light flashes when JH's are almost two-thirds (64%) over rated capacity. One logical direction to take would be a comprehensive effort at creating safe and effective alternatives to JH's. Several of the jurisdictions visited during the summer of 2000 expressed concern that juveniles who can be better served in alternative detention options are in secure JH's. Some counties in California, such as Santa Cruz, have developed comprehensive alternatives to JH's. Not only is this a less restrictive and safe approach, it is also very cost effective when compared to building new JH's.

Juvenile Correctional Facilities (JCF)

- Many smaller jurisdictions do not have a JCF in their county. Those counties refer to other counties or use the California Youth Authority (CYA).
- Only 22 of 35 counties responding have JCF's
- Eight counties reported having more than one JCF
- Four counties have an average daily population that exceeds their rated capacity
- Ten counties have an average daily population at exactly the rated capacity
- Twenty-four counties have an average daily population under the rated capacity.
- There were a total of 38 responses from 35 counties.

Comments: Thirty-four of the 38 responses (89%) have JCF population at the rated capacity or lower. Overcrowding at these facilities is not a major problem. **At least three reasons were identified during county interviews in 2000 that relate to this issue: 1) limited county resources to pay for JCF's especially in counties that do not have their own facilities; 2) lack of confidence in the quality of services provided in JCF's; 3) reluctance by the judiciary to give up on serving the juveniles in programs provided in their local counties.**

The PSTF should address this issue and make recommendations that would result in a statewide strategy and philosophy that will maximize the available JH and JCF resources with the needs of the juvenile probation population.

CASELOAD AND CASE ASSIGNMENT OF PROBATION OFFICERS

6. Indicate the average daily caseload *per* Deputy Probation Officer

Adults Intensive Supervision

a. Sex Offender

- Twenty-one counties have this program

- Average caseload sizes ranged from 15-174

<u>Caseload</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ 0-25	5
▪ 26-50	7
▪ 51-75	3
▪ 76-100	3
▪ 101-125	2
▪ 126-150	0
▪ 151-175	1

- Twelve of 21 counties (57%) have average caseloads of 50 or fewer.
- Nine of 21 counties (43%) have average caseloads of 51-175.

Comments: The key question is how are individual counties defining intensive supervision? Based on what measure? Based on what contact and service delivery expectation? Probation must beware of creating a false illusion of what "intensive" means. There appears to be no statewide definition of intensive supervision based on a workunit process that allows each program to have realistic outcome measures.

Some of these intensive supervision services may have started with a specific caseload capacity, but increasing needs resulted in caseload numbers that grew beyond a realistic capacity. Programs labeled "intensive" must have the capacity to close intake or face the consequences of having no positive impact on the identified offender population. The resulting outcome is reduced community confidence in the mission of probation. These comments pertain to all the intensive programs discussed in question six.

b. Drug Court and Drug Caseload

- Thirty counties offer this intensive supervision
- Fifteen of 30 (50%) have average caseloads of 50 or fewer
- Fifteen of 30 (50%) have average caseloads of 51-200
- The average caseload ranged from 3 to 200

c. Domestic Violence

- Twenty-six counties have intensive domestic violence programs
- Ten of 26 (38%) have average caseloads of 50 or fewer
- Nine of 26 (35%) have average caseloads of 51-100
- Seven of 26 (27%) have average caseloads of 101-275

Comments: There is apparently a myriad of services for domestic violence in each of the counties reporting. This makes it difficult to determine if we are measuring the same programs. **Is California using a domestic violence caseload standard? A reasonable goal would be to set a standard workload based on necessary services and programs so the state can be assured of some level of consistency in addressing the issues of domestic violence.**

d. Gang Violence

- Eight counties have intensive gang violence programs.
- The average caseload size ranges from 15-100.
- Four of 8 (50%) reporting have average caseloads of 50 or fewer
- Four of 8 (50%) reporting have average caseloads of 51-100

e. Other Listed Intensive Services

<u>Service</u>	<u>Counties</u>	<u>Average Caseloads</u>
▪ Mental Health	4	30, 32, 32, 73
▪ High Priority	2	75, 100
▪ Drug Testing	2	19, 35
▪ Child Abuse	1	40
▪ Elder Abuse	1	40
▪ Cal Works	1	54
▪ Family Violence	1	35
▪ Welfare Fraud	1	
▪ Violence Against Women	1	30
▪ Men & Their Children	1	35
▪ Intensive WPD	1	66
▪ Intensive SCPD	1	40
▪ PC1000	1	900
▪ Placement	1	65

Adult Regular Supervision Average Caseload

- Thirty-seven counties provided data.
- Four counties have no regular adult probation supervision. Probationers are probably in banked, intensive, or specialized caseloads.

Average regular supervision caseload data:

<u>Caseload</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ 0-50	1
▪ 51-100	4
▪ 101-150	5
▪ 151-200	5
▪ 201-250	3
▪ 251-300	3
▪ 301-350	2
▪ 351-400	1
▪ 401-450	3
▪ 451-500	3
▪ 601-700	1
▪ 801-900	1
▪ 1,401-1,500	1
▪ Five of 33 (15%) of counties responding have average caseloads of fewer than 100.	
▪ Ten of 33 (30%) have caseloads averaging between 101-200.	
▪ Six of 33 (18%) average between 201-300.	
▪ Three of 33 (9%) average between 301-400.	
▪ Six of 33 (18%) average between 401-500.	
▪ One of 33 (3%) average between 601-700	
▪ Two of 33 (6%) average more than 801.	

Comments: Fifty-five percent of all counties reporting have average regular caseloads over 200 and 36% over 301. **This gives a clear picture of the limited resources and the priority given to supervising the regular adult probation caseload. This is**

alarming when we look at the percentage of adult probationers convicted of felony offenses. Other sections of this report name public safety as the highest priority by those counties reporting. Unsupervised adult felons are a major public safety concern that needs to be addressed.

Adult Banked Average Caseloads

- Thirty-two counties provided banked caseload data.
- Average banked caseloads ranged from 15 to 11,500.

<u>Caseload</u>	<u>Number</u>
-----------------	---------------

▪ 0-250	4
▪ 251-500	5
▪ 501-1,000	8
▪ 1,001-2,000	4
▪ 2,001-3,000	3
▪ 3,001-4,000	2
▪ 4,001-5,000	1
▪ 5,001-6,000	1
▪ 6,001-7,000	2
▪ 11,001-12,000	2

- Seventeen of 32 county responses (53%) have average banked caseloads of fewer than 1,000.
- Fifteen of 32 responses (47%) have average banked caseloads of over 1,000.
- Two of 32 responses (6%) have average banked caseloads of over 11,001.

Comments: There must be many felony offenders on banked caseloads that would benefit from some direct probation supervision. **What is the new offense rate of adult offenders on banked caseloads? Are there any comparisons with reasonable average regular supervision caseloads? How is the risk to the community from banked caseloads being addressed? It is inappropriate and basically unfair to continue to under-fund probation departments and at the same time have higher**

performance expectations than are realistic. Probation departments are currently set up to fail as service providers and community protectors.

7. Juvenile Home-Intensive Average Supervision Caseload

Gang Violence

- Ten county responses
- Average caseload ranged from 19-66

<u>Caseload</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ 0-20	1
▪ 21-30	3
▪ 31-40	2
▪ 41-50	2
▪ 51-60	0
▪ 61-70	2

Transition Aftercare

- Eight counties responded
- Average caseload ranged from 14-46

<u>Caseload</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ 0-20	3
▪ 21-30	2
▪ 31-40	1
▪ 41-50	1
▪ 51-60	0
▪ 61-70	1

Drug Programs

- Six counties responded
- Average caseload ranged from 12-61

<u>Caseload</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ 0-20	2
▪ 21-30	1
▪ 31-40	0
▪ 41-50	1
▪ 51-60	1
▪ 61-70	1

Family Caseload

- Six counties responded
- Average caseload range from 14-46

<u>Caseload</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ 0-20	1
▪ 21-30	3
▪ 31-40	0
▪ 41-50	2

Drug Court

- Eight counties responded
- Average caseload ranged from 5-60

<u>Caseload</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ 0-20	3
▪ 21-30	2
▪ 31-40	1
▪ 41-50	1
▪ 41-50	0
▪ 51-60	1

Sex Offender

- Five counties responded
- Average caseload ranged from 3-60

<u>Caseload</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ 0-20	2
▪ 21-30	1
▪ 31-40	1
▪ 41-50	0
▪ 51-60	1

High Risk

- Three counties responded
- Average caseloads: 23, 30, 35

Intensive Supervision

- Three counties responded
- Average caseloads: 50, 53, 64
- **School**
 - Two county responses
 - Average caseloads 32, 47
 - Two responses with caseloads of 31, 34
- **Day Reporting Center**
 - One response with caseload of 20
- **Wrap Around Services**
 - One response with caseload of 15
- **ROPP**
 - One response with caseload of 15
- **Drug Testing**
 - One response with caseload of 9
- **SB 1095**
- **Women/Children Watch**

- **Service Integrated Teams**
 - One response with a caseload of 20
- **Juvenile Auto Theft**
 - One response with caseload of 20
- **601/co. Day School**
 - One response with a caseload of 80
- **Challenge II**
 - One response with a caseload of 15
 - **Crossroads (Mental Health)**
 - One response with a caseload of 10
 - **Placement Intervention**
 - **System of Care**
 - One response with a caseload of 9

Juvenile Home-Regular Supervision

- Thirty-nine counties responded. One had no regular probation supervision.
- The average caseloads ranged from 8-705

<u>Caseload</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ 0-25	3
▪ 26-50	8
▪ 51-75	5
▪ 76-100	2
▪ 101-150	8
▪ 151-200	1
▪ 201-300	5
▪ 301-400	0
▪ 401-500	3
▪ 501-600	0
▪ 601-700	2
▪ 701-800	1

Comments: Eleven of 38 (29%) have average caseloads under 50. Eighteen of 38 (47%) have average caseloads of 100 or fewer. Fifty-three percent have average caseloads of over 101 including 16% with caseloads averaging more than 401. **The use of specialized and intensive supervision programs with lower caseloads is a useful strategy to supervise the juvenile probation population.**

Juvenile caseloads in California appear to be too high. This can only be verified with a work-unit counting system that measures the types of services and contacts a juvenile needs, determines how much time it takes to complete every activity involved, and provides enough probation officers to do the job. *It is recommended that an accurate analysis of the actual workload of probation staff in each county must be addressed by PSTF.* That is the only objective means to verify resource needs.

Juvenile Home-Banked

- Nineteen counties responded with numbers for average banked caseloads
- The average banked caseloads ranged from 2 - 1,070

<u>Caseload</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ 0-100	7
▪ 101-200	4
▪ 201-300	3
▪ 301-400	1
▪ 401-500	0
▪ 501-600	1
▪ 601-700	0
▪ 701-800	2
▪ 1,001-1,100	1

Comments: Eleven of 19 responses (58%) have average banked caseloads of 200 or fewer and another 42% have average banked caseloads between 201 - 1,070.

Juvenile Placement

- Thirty-nine counties responded
- The number of placements varied between 2 – 325

<u>Caseload</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ 0-25	15
▪ 26-50	18
▪ 51-76	2
▪ 76-100	2
▪ 101-200	1
▪ 201-300	0
▪ 301-400	1

Probation Supervision Workload Standards Recommendations

During the site visits to six California county probation departments in the summer of 2000, staff was asked about the system that is used to determine equal workload distribution to probation staff. **All jurisdictions replied that there is no system in place. There are no workload standards for any juvenile or adult probation program in any of the six counties visited.** It has been determined that grant funded positions have reduced caseloads in some departments. In only one county, specialized caseloads have a maximum number of cases. Otherwise, **workload standards are determined by the number of staff available to cover the total number of cases.** One department reduced the number of adult probation cases to 100:1 officer, then banked the remainder. One department determines workload size during the collective bargaining process with the union. **None of the six counties reviewed has conducted a recent time study to determine workload capacity.**

Workload measure rather than caseload size is the most accurate and effective gauge to equalize work distribution among probation officers. The White Papers indicate that workload measures realistically consider the number of cases, contacts, and other responsibilities for each case, as well as considering job responsibilities not specifically related to case management. Probationers should be treated differently

depending on the amount and type of supervision required. Each case has a weighted value depending on risk/need that helps determine an equal distribution of workloads over a period of time. Probation officers can then be held to the same standards of performance. *The PSTF should recommend a strategy for determining accurate workload measures in each county.*

8. Do you use a risk assessment tools?

8a. Adult

- Thirty-nine counties responded
- Twenty-two of 39 counties (56%) responded "yes"
- Seventeen of 39 counties (44%) responded "no"

8b. Juvenile

- Thirty-nine counties responded
- Twenty-four of 39 counties (62%) responded "yes"
- Fifteen of 39 counties (38%) responded "no"

Comments: It is difficult to determine through a survey technique alone how risk/needs assessment tools are used for both juvenile and adult offenders in each county. **These same questions were asked of probation managers during the six site visits. It was determined that risk/needs assessments are not administered to the total juvenile probation population. Assessments were most frequently used with specialized programs that are grant related. For the adult offender, risk/needs assessments were administered in four of the six counties. In none of the six counties were the needs implemented through the assessment tools used. The high caseload averages and large number of banked caseloads prevented some staff from addressing offender needs.**

The Juvenile and Adult White Papers stress the importance of properly assessing all offenders. Today, assessment tools are probation officer friendly. They are self administered on personal computers, scored, and results printed within twenty to

thirty minutes. None of this requires time from probation staff. The more advanced instruments have a validation component that determines the truthfulness of the test taker. The better instruments are validated and normed to the probation population in each local jurisdiction. With the proper equipment, a single trained person can administer the assessment instrument to as many as fifteen people at the same time. This represents considerable timesaving for staff. With good assessments, staff can focus on identified needs and not spend time on a "shotgun" approach to problems. Assessment of juvenile and adult probationer's risk/need are essential for maximizing the limited resources available to serve this population. The PSTF should address this issue as part of the mandate for improving probation services.

9. How are adult cases assigned?

- There were a total of 78 responses. Many counties had more than one method of assigning cases.
- The type and number of case assignment responses follows:
 - Specialized case type 37
 - Rotation 12
 - Amount of Work 19
 - Geographic 12

Comments: Thirty-seven of 80 responses (46%) assign according to specialized case type. CPO's faced with management issues of the most effectively utilization of limited staff chose specialized intensive supervision, such as sex offender, drug court and drug caseloads, gang violence, domestic violence, and other specialized programs. These specialized intensive supervision caseloads are considerably smaller than regular probation caseloads.

It is significant to note that 44% of the 39 counties reporting do not administer *any* risk/need assessment instruments and the other 56% probably do not provide assessments to their entire adult probation population.

How are we determining the eligibility and needs of adult offenders in the specialized intensive supervision caseloads, other than by offense? Are probation departments providing relevant resources to the appropriate offender population? Without risk/needs assessments of the entire probation population, we are guessing and most likely inappropriately utilizing limited staff resources.

10. How are juvenile cases assigned?

- There were a total of 82 responses. Many counties have several methods of assigning cases.
- The type and number of case assignment responses were as follows:
 - Specialized case type 34
 - Rotation 8
 - Amount of work 18
 - School 5
 - Geographic 17

Comments: Although, the regular juvenile caseloads are lower than their adult counterparts, 41% of the responses assign to specialized intensive supervision caseloads or programs.

Comparing Juvenile and Adult Caseloads

- Current regular and banked caseloads representing the *majority* of offenders on probation vary significantly from adult to juvenile caseloads.
- **Fifteen percent of adult average caseloads are 100 or fewer as compared with 47% for juvenile caseloads.**
- **Forty-five percent of adult average caseloads are 200 or fewer as compared with 69% for juvenile caseloads**
- **Twenty-seven percent of adult average caseloads are between 301-500 as compared with 8% for juvenile caseloads.**
- Again, limited resources drive CPO's to identify specialized categories of offenders for intensive services.

PART 2: PROBATION SERVICES

1. List the types of services that the probation department provides for Adults and Juveniles

Adult Services

- Fifty-four counties responded
- Eight services have more than 40 "yes" responses
- Thirty-three different services are provided in at least one county
- There is a total of 801 services provided in 54 counties for adult probationers
- A list of adult services and the number of counties using them follows:

<u>Service</u>	<u>Number</u>
1. Anger Management	28
2. Batterers Programs	39
3. Community Services	36
4. Deferred Entry of Judgment	44
5. Detention Services	11
6. Disposition Reports	37
7. Domestic Violence Services	45
8. Drug Court Services	37
9. Electronic Monitoring	29
10. Gang Grant Services	14
11. Group Homes	2
12. Home Supervision Services	20
13. In Patient Mental Health	5
14. Informal Probation	10
15. Intake	16
16. Out-of-County/jurisdiction transfer	33
17. Out-of-Home Placements	4
18. Out-Patient Mental Health	26

19. Out-Patient Substance Abuse Treatment	31
20. Pre-sentence Investigation Reports	52
21. Residential Substance Abuse Treatment	27
22. Restitution to Victims	51
23. Reviews	46
24. Revocation Hearings	49
25. Serve as Hearing Officers	12
26. Sex Offender Services	35
27. Sex Offender Treatment	26
28. Supervision	52
29. Victim Impact Statements	48

Additional Adult Services

- Monitor Batterers & Drug Treatment Programs
- Work Furloughs (2)
- Drug Dog Officer
- Narcotics Enforcement Unit
- Drug Testing
- House Arrest
- Family Preservation
- Drug Education
- Partnership Mentally Ill Offenders
- DUI
- Adult Stalker
- Conflict Resolution
- Community Services Work Program (2)
- OR

Comments: Eight services had over 40 responses; 1) deferred entry of judgement, 2) domestic violence services, 3) pre-sentence investigations, 4) restitution to victims, 5) reviews, 6) revocation hearings, 7) supervision, and 8) victim impact statements. Most of

these services provide the basic information a judge needs to sentence and track the general progress of adult offenders.

The PSTF now has data that indicates that most counties have basic services for adult offenders. With the limited resources available for adult probationers, recommendations for standards of performance for services already in place is a realistic approach to improve adult probation services.

Juvenile Services

- Fifty-four counties responded
- Fourteen services have 40 or more "yes" responses
- Twenty-one services have 30 or more "yes" responses
- Fifty-six different services are provided in at least one county
- There were a total of 1,119 juvenile services reported from 54 counties
- A list of juvenile services and the number of counties providing them follows:

<u>Service</u>	<u>Number</u>
1. Anger Management	36
2. Batterers Programs	10
3. Community Services	42
4. Deferred Entry of Judgment	29
5. Detention Services	46
6. Disposition Reports	46
7. Domestic Violence Services	15
8. Drug Court Services	25
9. Drug Testing in Schools	29
10. Electronic Monitoring	36
11. Foster Care	40
12. Gang Grant Services	23
13. Group Homes	39
14. Home Supervision Services	47
15. In Patient Mental Health	15

16. Informal Probation	46
17. Intake	47
18. Out-of-County/Jurisdiction Transfer	47
19. Out-of-Home Placements	47
20. Out-Patient Mental Health	32
21. Out-Patient Substance Abuse Treatment	31
22. Pre-sentence Investigation Reports	22
23. Residential Substance Abuse Treatment	23
24. Restitution to Victims	46
25. Reviews	44
26. Revocation Hearings	42
27. Serve as Hearing Officers	31
28. Sex Offender Services	31
29. Sexual Offender Treatment	26
30. Supervision	49
31. Victim Impact Statements	43

Additional Juvenile Services

- Restorative Justice
- Campus Probation Officers (3)
- Drug Testing (2)
- ROPP (2)
- Work Crew (3)
- Prevention Services
- Gang Task Force
- Court Day School
- Community Services Work Program (2)
- Children's System of Collaboration
- Boot Camps
- Paternity Programs
- Family Assessments

- Victim Awareness Training
- Life Skills Training
- Day Reporting Center
- Visual Learning Therapy
- Youth Accountability Boards
- Police Probation Diversion
- Independent Living Skills (2)
- Alternatives to Placement
- Truancy Reduction
- Behavior Modification
- In-School Suspension
- Culture & Diversity Services

Comments: Juvenile probation offers 55 different services as compared with 33 services for adult offenders. There is a wide variety of treatment services and programs for juvenile probationers as well as a range of community agencies involved in partnerships and collaborations with juvenile probation.

Comments on Juvenile and Adult Services Comparisons

The juvenile probation population in California, as in all states, is many times smaller than the adult probation population. A budget analysis of the six counties visited in 2000, show an almost equal distribution of funds for juvenile and adult probation services. This is reflected in the number and types of services provided to the juvenile and adult probation populations. Juvenile probation services in California provide 55 different services compared to 33 services for adult probationers. This is even more significant when you factor in the much smaller juvenile population. The total number of probation services offered in the 53 counties responding to the survey show a total of 1,119 for juvenile compared to 801 for adult.

The types of services provided to the juvenile population is far more creative and involves many more community agencies and partnerships. The models and relationships being developed in the juvenile arena are readily transferable to adult services. The expertise is already available in each probation department and only awaits proper resources to be implemented in adult. The creativity for probation services already exists in California.

2. List the types of specialized court programs available to adults and juveniles in your county.

Adult

- Fifty-three counties responded
- Eight specific specialized court services were listed
- Drug courts were identified in 32 of the 53 (60%) of the counties
- The next closest specialized court was 18 (34%) of the counties
- A list of specialized adult court services follows:

<u>Service</u>	<u>Number</u>
1. Day Reporting Center	4
2. Domestic Violence Court	18
3. Drug Court	32
4. Early Disposition Programs	10
5. Gang Prevention Unit	6
6. Mental Health Court	4
7. Pretrial Informal Supervision	12
8. Victim Offender Reconciliation	1

- Other specialized court services listed
 - Supervised OR
 - Domestic Violence Calendar
 - Community Work Service Program
 - Supervision Court Review

Comments: Adult drug courts are becoming a core service of adult supervision. Much of the funding for drug courts comes from grants, but this will not offer long term funding. What is the funding strategy for these services to become a permanent budget item? The six sites visited in 2000 emphasized the outstanding partnerships and trust developed between courts, probation, and community service providers in operating specialized court programs. The loss of specialized drug courts would seriously damage the positive image of community corrections in California.

Juvenile

- Fifty-three counties responded
- Nine specialized services were identified
- Thirty-three counties provide informal juvenile and traffic court
- Twenty-four counties provide juvenile drug courts
- The following types and number of specialized juvenile court programs follows:

<u>Program</u>	<u>Number</u>
1. Day Reporting Centers	12
2. Drug Court	24
3. Early Disposition Services	10
4. Gang Prevention Unit	12
5. Informal Juvenile & Traffic Court	33
6. Neighborhood Accountability Boards	9
7. Peer Court	18
8. Pretrial Informal Supervision	14
9. Victim Offender Reconciliation	12

Comments: Seven specialized juvenile court services are being offered in 12 - 33 counties as compared with three specialized adult court services in the same number of counties. This is significant because a much larger number of adult probationers are getting fewer specialized services compared with the juvenile probation population. We must again ask funding questions. **How many of these specialized juvenile court**

services are permanently funded? How many are grant funded? If these programs have positive evaluations, planning for permanent funding is essential if California is to maintain the same quality of juvenile services attained during the last six years.

PART 3: GOALS AND PRIORITIES OF PROBATION DEPARTMENT

1. Does your probation department have a written mission statement?

- Forty counties responded
- Thirty-four (85%) responded "yes"
- Six (15%) responded "no"

1a. When was the department's mission statement written?

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
▪ 2000	3	10%
▪ 1999	4	10%
▪ 1998	3	10%
▪ 1997	2	7%
▪ 1996	2	7%
▪ 1995	4	13%
▪ 1994	1	3%
▪ 1991	2	7%
▪ 1990	4	13%
▪ 1989	1	3%
▪ 1988	2	7%
▪ 1987	1	3%
▪ 1985	1	3%
▪ 1970's	1	3%

Comments: Thirty-one counties provided information about when their latest mission statement was written. Fourteen (45%) of the counties responding have a mission statement that was written in the last five years. Seventeen (55%) have mission statements written more than five years ago. **Ten (32%) of these have not had a mission statement written in the last ten years.**

1b. How often is the mission statement reviewed?

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
▪ Annually	17	52%
▪ Periodically	2	6%
▪ No Routine Review	4	12%
▪ As Needed	3	9%
▪ No Review	1	3%
▪ Every 2 years	2	6%
▪ Every 3 years	1	3%
▪ Every 4 years	1	3%
▪ 10-15 years	2	6%

Comments: Nine (27%) had vague answers such as “periodically,” “no routine review,” or “as needed.” Fifty-two percent have annual reviews of their mission statement.

Mission statements do not have to be written every year, but they need to be reviewed annually.

2. Does your probation department have written annual objectives for:

2a. Adult Services:

▪ "YES"	19 responses	46%
▪ "NO"	22 responses	54%

2b. Juvenile services:

▪ "YES"	18 responses	44%
▪ "NO"	23 responses	56%

Comments: Examples of objectives given in some of the 17 "yes" responses in juvenile and 19 in adult do not fit the definition of department objectives. **The mission statement is a declaration of the main purpose of the department. The objectives provide the specific action steps required at every level of the organization to implement the mission and to insure that all employees are working toward the same goals. This becomes even more significant in departments that have many new employees with limited corrections experience. None of the six counties visited during 2000 had department objectives for every level of the organization. However, specific objectives are in place for some grant related programs.**

It is difficult to have annual objectives without reviewing the mission statement as part of the process. Mission statements may remain as written, but they must be reviewed.

3. List *in order of importance* your top five priorities for probation.

Adult Priorities

1. Public Safety 39 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #1	35
▪ #2	3
▪ #3	1

2. Offender Accountability 31 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #1	1
▪ #2	20
▪ #3	5
▪ #4	4
▪ #5	1

3. Rehabilitation 26 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #2	3
▪ #3	8
▪ #4	7
▪ #5	8

4. Compliance with Court Orders 23 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #1	2
▪ #2	6
▪ #3	11
▪ #4	1
▪ #5	3

5. Victim's services 14 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #2	4
▪ #3	8
▪ #4	1
▪ #5	1

6. Monitoring 13 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #2	1
▪ #3	3
▪ #4	6
▪ #5	3

7. Re-integration 13 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #4	5
▪ #5	8

8. Education 5 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #4	3
▪ #5	2

9. Restorative Justice 4 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #4	2
▪ #5	2

10. More Funding 3 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #1	2
▪ #3	1

11. Staff Accountability 3 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #1	2
▪ #3	1

12. Training 3 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #4	1
▪ #5	2

13. Employment 3 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #4	2
▪ #5	1

14. Expand Adult Supervision 2 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #4	1
▪ #5	1

15. Restitution 2 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #3	1
▪ #4	1

Note: One response was recorded for each of the following.

16. Risk Management	#5
17. Community Sanctions	#5
18. Automation	#2
19. Domestic Violence Supervision	#3
20. Investigations & Court Services	#3
21. Drug Rehabilitation	#5
22. Parenting/Family Stability	#5
23. Prevention	#4
24. Community Involvement	#4
25. Competency Development	#4
26. Deter Offenders	#3
27. Drug Court Services	#2
28. Manageable Case Loads	#5

Highest Rated #1 Priorities**42 county responses**

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ Public Safety	35
▪ More funding	2
▪ Staff Accountability	2
▪ Compliance with Court Orders	2
▪ Offender Accountability	1

Thirty -five (83%) of the counties responding selected public safety as the clear number one priority.

The next highest number one priorities represent only 5% of the counties reporting.

Highest Rated #2 Priorities**38 county responses**

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ Offender Accountability	20
▪ Compliance with Court Orders	6
▪ Victim Services	4
▪ Public Safety	3
▪ Rehabilitation	2
▪ Monitoring	1
▪ Automation	1
▪ Expand Adult Supervision	1

Offender accountability represents 53% of the number two priorities.

Public safety and offender accountability dominated the two highest priorities.

These address the issue of safety to the community.

Highest Rated #3 Priorities**41 county responses**

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ Compliance with Court Order	11
▪ Rehabilitation	8
▪ Victim Services	8
▪ Offender Accountability	5

▪ Monitoring	3
▪ Public Safety	1
▪ More Funding	1
▪ Staff Accountability	1
▪ Domestic Violence Supervision	1
▪ Investigations & Court Services	1
▪ Deter Offenders	1

Highest Rated # 4 Priorities

33 county responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ Rehabilitation	7
▪ Monitoring	6
▪ Re-integration	5
▪ Offender Accountability	4
▪ Education	3
▪ Restorative Justice	2
▪ Employment	2
▪ Training	1
▪ Victim Services	1
▪ Compliance with Court Orders	1
▪ Restitution	1

Highest Rated #5 Priorities

35 county responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ Re-integration	8
▪ Rehabilitation	8
▪ Compliance with Court Orders	3
▪ Monitoring	3
▪ Education	2
▪ Restorative Justice	2
▪ Training	2

▪ Employment	1
▪ Victim Services	1
▪ Offender Accountability	1
▪ Risk Management	1
▪ Community Sanctions	1
▪ Drug Rehabilitation	1
▪ Parenting/Family Stability	1

Comments: Public safety was listed as either priority number one or number two by 38 of the 41 counties reporting. Offender accountability, which could be interpreted as having a high correlation with public safety, is listed as priority one or two in 21 counties. Rehabilitation, with 25 county responses, compliance with court orders, (23 responses,) victim services (14 responses,) and monitoring (13 responses,) round out the next highest numbers of priority ratings.

Juvenile Priorities

1. Public Safety 36 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #1	29
▪ #2	6
▪ #4	1

2. Offender Accountability 27 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #1	2
▪ #2	14
▪ #3	7
▪ #4	2
▪ #5	2

3. Rehabilitation 26 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #1	1
▪ #2	7
▪ #3	8
▪ #4	3
▪ #5	7

4. Education/Training 21 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #3	5
▪ #4	11
▪ #5	5

5. Compliance with Court Orders 15 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ # 1	3
▪ #2	3
▪ #3	6
▪ #4	1
▪ # 5	2

6. Re-integration 9 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #4	5
▪ #5	4

7. Victim Rights 9 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ # 2	2
▪ #3	4

- #4 1
- #5 2

8. Monitoring 7 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #1	1
▪ #3	2
▪ #4	3
▪ #5	1

9. Prevention 4 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #2	2
▪ #4	1
▪ #5	1

10. Family Stability 3 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #3	1
▪ #4	1
▪ #5	1

11. Community Restoration 2 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #4	1
▪ #5	1

12. More Funding 2 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #1	2

13. Restorative Justice 2 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #2	1
▪ #3	1

14. School Bases Programs 2 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ #1	
▪ #3	

15. Juvenile Drug Court #2

16. Early Assessment #3

17. Collaborative Partner Agreement #5

18. Better-Run Institutional Programs #5

19. Training #5

20. Restitution #4

21. CYA Cost Relief #5

22. New Juvenile Hall #3

Highest Rated #1 Priorities 38 county responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Responses</u>
▪ Public Safety	29
▪ Offender Accountability	2
▪ Compliance with Court Orders	3
▪ More Funding	2
▪ Monitoring	1
▪ School Based Programs	1

Twenty-eight (76%) identified public safety as the highest priority

Highest Rated #2 Priorities**36 county responses**PriorityResponses

▪ Offender Accountability	14
▪ Public Safety	6
▪ Rehabilitation	7
▪ Prevention	2
▪ Compliance with Court Order	3
▪ Victim Rights	2
▪ Juvenile Drug Court	1
▪ Restorative Justice	1

Offender Accountability, Public Safety, and Rehabilitation account for 75% of the #2 priorities.

Highest Rated #3 Priorities**36 county responses**PriorityResponses

▪ Rehabilitation	8
▪ Compliance with Court Orders	6
▪ Offender Accountability	7
▪ Education/Training	5
▪ Victim Rights	4
▪ Monitoring	2
▪ Family Stability	1
▪ Restorative Justice	1
▪ Early Assessment	1
▪ Juvenile Hall	1

Highest Rated #4 Priority**32 county responses**PriorityResponses

▪ Education/Training	11
▪ Re-integration	5
▪ Monitoring	3

▪ Offender Accountability	2
▪ Rehabilitation	3
▪ Compliance with Court Orders	1
▪ Victims Rights	1
▪ Prevention	1
▪ Family Stability	1
▪ Community Restoration	1
▪ Restitution	1
▪ Public Safety	1
▪ School Based Programs	1

Education/Training, Re-integration, and Monitoring represent 59% of all the #4 priorities.

Highest Rated # 5 Priorities

29 county responses

Priority

Responses

▪ Rehabilitation	7
▪ Education/Training	4
▪ Re-integration	4
▪ Compliance with Court Orders	2
▪ Offender Accountability	2
▪ Victim Rights	2
▪ Monitoring	1
▪ Prevention	1
▪ Family Stability	1
▪ Community Restoration	1
▪ Collaborative Partnership	1
▪ More Efficient Instit. Programs	1
▪ Training	1
▪ CYA Cost Relief	1

Comments: Public safety was listed as priority one or two by 35 of the counties reporting. Offender Accountability, which has a high correlation with public safety, is listed as priority one or two in 16 counties. Twenty-five counties gave the next highest priority ratings to Rehabilitation, followed by 15 for Compliance with Court Orders, and 9 for Victim Rights.

4. Has probation tried any innovative programs in the last 3 years that have proven effective?

- Forty-nine counties responded "YES" to this question
- Five counties responded "NO"
- A listing of innovative programs tried in the last 3 years follows:

<u>Program</u>	<u>Number of counties</u>
▪ Drug Court Services (adult)	28
▪ Drug Court Services (juvenile)	18
▪ Challenge	13
▪ Domestic Violence Caseloads	9
▪ School Based Probation Programs	7
▪ Neighborhood Accountability Boards	6
▪ Gang Project	5
▪ Multi-Agency Integrated Service Team	5
▪ Day Reporting Center	5
▪ Repeat offender Prevention Program	5
▪ Gender Specific Programs & Treatment for Girls	4
▪ Children's System of Care	4
▪ Family Preservation	4
▪ Peer Court	3
▪ Mentally Ill Offender Program	3
▪ Electronic Monitoring	3
▪ Boot Camp	3
▪ Wrap-around Services Program	3
▪ Aftercare Programs	2

▪ Life Skills	2
▪ Transition Center (ranches to home)	2
▪ First Offender Program	2
▪ Day Treatment Family Intervention (8%)	2
▪ Sex Offender Unit Program	2
▪ Juvenile Placement & Assessment Center	2
▪ Juvenile Community Work Services	2
▪ Family Violence Intervention	1
▪ Juvenile Hall Victim Impact Classes	1
▪ DUI Caseload	1
▪ Felony Early Disposition Program	1
▪ Adult Job Readiness & Placement Services	1
▪ Adult AIDS Education	1
▪ Adult Warrant Team	1
▪ Adult Intensive Supervision	1
▪ House Arrest	1
▪ Men & Their Families	1
▪ Women & Their Families	1
▪ SARB	1
▪ Child Abuse Prevention	1
▪ Crossroads (diversion juvenile)	1
▪ Adult Community Work Services	1
▪ Conflict Resolution	1
▪ Facility for Emotionally Disturbed Boys	1
▪ Juvenile Restitution Program	1
▪ Probation Alternatives	1
▪ Juvenile Vocational Education Programs	1
▪ Outcome Measures	1
▪ More Probation Officers	1
▪ In-house Computer System	1
▪ Residential Treatment Program	1

Comments: It is important to note that there is no definition to determine "effectiveness". Responses may be based on evaluation data or anecdotal information. During the last 3 years, counties listed 50 programs reporting a total of 168 innovative efforts. The most comprehensive efforts were in adult drug court services (28), juvenile drug court services (18), challenge (13), and domestic violence caseload (9). All four of these innovative programs and services have considerable grant money from the federal or state level.

There appears to be a strong desire to be innovative. Limited resources, not lack of ideas, are the principle drawback to positive change. There needs to be a way to permanently fund recognized innovative programs that focus on involving key community stakeholders.

The six probation departments interviewed in 2000 have shown a dramatic increase in total department funding over the last five fiscal years. The increases ranged from 24% to 83%. The general fund contributions to the total budget ranged from 35% to 58.3%. The budget for four of the six departments received general funds of less than 50% of the total budget, with one department receiving less than 40%. With the exception of one unreported department, all others indicate that the percentage of their general fund contributions have decreased. In one jurisdiction the decrease since 1997 is 35%, and in another 18%.

The primary revenue increases have come from federal, state, and fee increases. In the juvenile service area, a substantial amount of funding has come from grant funds. It is important to recognize the changing funding sources for probation departments. Many of the specialized programs and services are grant funded. A considerable number of positions are financed with grant money.

This same scenario occurred in the 1970's at which time the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) distributed large amounts of money to state and local probation departments. When those resources ended, many progressive

probation programs were severely damaged or eliminated. It took more than a decade to recover from the loss of services. The community confidence in probation departments dramatically decreased. The current abundance of grant money for special programs and services will diminish, and counties need to prepare to finance programs proven to be effective.

5. Has probation tried any innovative programs in the last 3 years that were not proven successful?

- Fifty-five counties responded
- Fourteen of 55 (25%) tried innovative programs that were not successful
- Forty-one of 55 (75%) reported successful innovative programs
- Programs identified as unsuccessful:
 - Probation Counseling for Anger Management; (turf war problem)
 - R.O.C.K. Program; (problems at prison precluded further participation)
 - Community Assisting Parents; (poor parent participation)
 - Supervision Unit intended to involve families with parents and youth on probation; (lack of court support)
 - Early Resolution Sentencing Program for Adults; (lack of participation by the public defender)
 - Challenge II Grant; (difficulty in implementation)
 - Restorative Justice; (no board support)
 - Aftercare
 - Limited Service Caseloads; (did not work)
 - Adult pre-sentenced electronic monitoring
 - Pilot program with adult probation officer in court
 - Intensive Diversion Supervision to Low Risk Minors; (services were not needed)
 - Organizational Advisory Committee (not well received by most staff)

6. Please indicate in order of preference any services you would like to add or improve.

1. Increased Funding to Reduce Adult & Juvenile Caseloads 24 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ #1	15
▪ #2	4
▪ #3	3
▪ #4	2

2. Juvenile and Adult Drug Treatment and Drug Court (including inpatient drug treatment) 23 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ #1	4
▪ #2	8
▪ #3	3
▪ #4	7
▪ #5	1

3. Juvenile & Adult Mental Health Service (expansion, prevention, more outpatient) 15 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ #1	5
▪ #2	4
▪ #3	4
▪ #4	1
▪ #5	1

4. Juvenile Hall (alternatives, replacement, expansion, services) 13 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ #1	6
▪ #2	3
▪ #3	3
▪ #5	1

5. Adult and Juvenile Intensive Supervision Programs 10 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ #1	5
▪ #2	4
▪ #5	1

6. Probation Officers on School Campus 9 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ # 1	2
▪ #2	2
▪ #3	2
▪ #4	1
▪ #5	2

7. Domestic Violence Court with Comprehensive Services 7 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ #1	2
▪ #4	3
▪ #5	2

8. Automation System Evaluations 7 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ #1	3
▪ #2	2
▪ #3	1
▪ #4	1

9. Victim Services (including reconciliation)

7 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ #1	1
▪ #2	3
▪ #3	1
▪ #5	2

10. Juvenile and Adult Electronic Monitoring

6 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ #1	1
▪ #2	2
▪ #3	3

11. Juvenile Vocational Educational Programs

6 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ #1	1
▪ #2	1
▪ #3	2
▪ #4	2

12. Restorative Justice

5 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ # 1	1
▪ #2	1
▪ #3	1
▪ #5	2

13. Status Offender Services (including truancy)

5 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ #2	3
▪ #3	2

14. Early Intervention High Risk Youth

5 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ #2	2
▪ #3	1
▪ #4	1
▪ #5	1

15. Improved Multi-disciplinary Services

5 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ #1	1
▪ #3	2
▪ #4	1
▪ #5	1

16. Day Reporting Centers

4 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ #2	1
▪ #3	1
▪ #4	1
▪ #5	1

17. Assessment Centers

4 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ #1	2
▪ #2	1
▪ #4	1

18. Gang Related Services

3 responses

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Number</u>
▪ #1	1
▪ #4	2

19. Restitution Recovery Officer & Services	3 responses						
<table> <tr> <td><u>Priority</u></td><td><u>Number</u></td></tr> <tr> <td>▪ #2</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr> <td>▪ #4</td><td>1</td></tr> </table>	<u>Priority</u>	<u>Number</u>	▪ #2	2	▪ #4	1	
<u>Priority</u>	<u>Number</u>						
▪ #2	2						
▪ #4	1						
20. System of Care Approach	2 responses						
▪ Priorities # 1 & #3							
21. Peer Court	2 responses						
▪ Priority #4 & #5							
22. Sex Offender Treatment Program	2 responses						
▪ Priority #3 & #5							
23. After School Programs	2 responses						
▪ Priority#1 & #5							
24. Neighborhood Accountability Boards	2 responses						
▪ Priority #3 & #4							
25. Expanded Intermediate Sanctions for Juveniles	2 responses						
▪ Priority #1 & #2							
26. Aftercare services (released juveniles and adults)	2 responses						
▪ Priority #3 & #5							
27. Warrant Apprehension for Juveniles and Adults	2 responses						
▪ Priority # 2							
28. Juvenile Female Residential Treatment Program	2 responses						
▪ Priority #5							

Note: There was one response for each of the following.

	<u>Priority</u>
29. Services for Dual-diagnosed Clients	#5
30. Parents Mentoring Program	#3
31. Probation Absconder Unit	#3
32. Program Services for Latino Families	#5
33. Facility for Emotionally Disturbed Minors	#1
34. Juvenile Diversion	#1
35. Staff Training	#4
36. Juvenile Violence Court	#2
37. Juvenile Cognitive Behavior Curriculum	#5
38. Juvenile Therapeutic Foster Homes	#5
39. Juvenile Prevention Services	#3
40. Expand Challenge Program	#3
41. Community Out-stationing of Services	#5
42. More Pre-trial Release Services	#3
43. Community Work Program	#3
44. Child Abuse Caseload	#2
45. Better Management	#4
46. Placement Intervention Services	#1
47. Arming Selective Probation Officers	#1
48. Update Policies and Procedures	#2

Comments: Considerable time was required to cluster answers into categories of service or need. Information provided was not always clear and called for discretion to determine category placement. The question about priority of services generated a great deal of interest. There were 199 responses in 48 consolidated categories. The responses addressed a broad range of comprehensive probation services.

Interest in both juvenile and adult services was strong. However, many more responses addressed juvenile services and included detention and facilities.

The six areas receiving the highest number of responses are:

	<u>Responses</u>
▪ Reduced Adult & Juvenile Caseloads	24
▪ Juvenile & Adult Drug treatment, Drug Court, and Inpatient drug treatment	23
▪ Juvenile & Adult Mental Health Services, including service expansion, outpatient, and prevention	15
▪ Juvenile Hall including alternatives, replacement, and expansion of services	13
▪ Juvenile & Adult Intensive Supervision Services	10
▪ Probation Officers on School Campus	9

The categories that were most frequently ranked priority one or two are 1) reduced adult and juvenile caseloads (19), 2) juvenile and adult drug treatment and drug court (12), 3) mental health services (9), 4) juvenile hall (9), and 5) intensive supervision programs (9).

More financial resources are required to address all stated priorities. This survey gives an excellent snapshot of how counties would provide services if more resources were available. There is a strong and consistent theme that resources are sorely needed. Probation departments *want* to provide increased services at a quality level.

7. In general, do you believe that in the next 5 years the quality of probation services will:

	<u>Responses</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
▪ Decline Greatly	3	5%
▪ Decline Somewhat	8	13%
▪ Remain the Same	8	13%
▪ Improve Somewhat	28	44%
▪ Improve Greatly	16	25%

Comments: There is a sense of optimism and enthusiasm about the quality of probation services for the next 5 years. Of the 63 responses, 44 (70%) believe the quality of probation services will improve either somewhat or greatly. One-fourth of the respondents believe there will be a great improvement. When analyzing the responses, there appears to be more optimism for increased services for juvenile probation compared to adult probation.

8. Explain your answers to Question 7.

- Sixty-two respondents explained why the quality of probation services would increase.
- Twenty-one respondents gave reasons for a decrease in quality of services.
- Seventy-five percent of the responses to this question were positive.

Reasons for Improved Quality of Services

	<u>Number of Responses</u>
▪ Increased funding	18
▪ Increased collaboration with other agencies	12
▪ Effectiveness/evaluations using outcome measures	4
▪ Juvenile hall construction money	3
▪ Greater legislative emphasis on probation	3
▪ Funding for school resource probation officers	2
▪ Good management will improve services	2
▪ Broken windows model	1
▪ Value of early termination	1
▪ Specialized case management	1
▪ Increased local foster care	1
▪ Increased wrap-around services	1
▪ Reduce teenage pregnancies program	1
▪ Teen NA/AA Services	1
▪ Great relationship with BOS	1
▪ Specialized programs	1

▪ Improved data collection and sharing	1
▪ More juvenile funding	1
▪ More funding to smaller counties	1
▪ Community policing	1
▪ Proposition 36 funding	1
▪ Strategic Planning	1
▪ Officer safety (armed unit)	1
▪ Balance between juvenile and adult probation philosophies	1
▪ Updated policies and procedures	1
▪ Increased early intervention services	1

Reasons for Decreased Quality of Services

	<u>Number of responses</u>
▪ Budget problems	8
▪ Decline in services to adults (more banked caseloads)	5
▪ Problems recruiting and retaining staff	3
▪ Inappropriate funding under Proposition 36	2
▪ Too heavily grant funded	1
▪ Increase workload "catch and release" policy on drug cases under Proposition 36	1
▪ More difficult offenders	1

Comments: Increased funding was named by 42% of respondents as the reason for *improved* quality of probation services. Conversely, 38% of respondents named decreased funding as the reason for a *decline* of quality probation services.

Twenty-one percent of respondents believe that the key to improved quality probation services is to work in partnership with other community agencies and avoid "turf issues". This is encouraging because improvement does not require additional money, rather working in partnerships and maximizing available resources.

The category of budget declines fall into three primary responses: 1) decrease in budget, 2) declining services to adults, and 3) inappropriate funding of Proposition 36. These responses represent 71% (15) of the 21 comments on why probation services will decline.

STAKEHOLDER SURVEY RESPONSES BY COUNTY

COUNTY	CEO/ CAO	JUDGES & COURT ADMIN.	CPO	PO	DISTRICT ATTNY.	PUBLIC DE- FENDER
Alameda			X			
Alpine	X	X	X		X	
Amador		X	X			
Butte	NO	DATA				
Calaveras	X		X			
Colusa			X			
Contra Costa	X	X	X	X	X	
Del Norte	X		X			
El Dorado		X	X			
Fresno	X	X	X	X	X	X
Glenn			X			
Humboldt	X		X			
Imperial	X	X	X			
Inyo	X		X		X	
Kern	X	X	X		X	
Kings	X		X			
Lake	X		X			
Lassen			X			X
Los Angeles	X	X	X		X	
Madera	X		X	X		
Marin	X			X		
Mariposa			X			
Mendicino			X			
Merced	X		X			
Modoc						
Mono		X	X			
Monterey			X			
Napa		X	X		X	
Nevada		X				
Orange		X	X			X
Placer	X	X	X		X	
Plumas	X	X	X			
Riverside			X			
Sacramento		X	X			X
San Benito	X	X	X			
San Bernardino			X			
San Diego	X	X	X		X	
San Francisco			X		X	

San Joaquin			X			X
San Luis Obispo		X	X	X		
San Mateo			X			
Santa Barbara	X		X			
Santa Clara		X	X			X
Santa Cruz		X	X			
Shasta			X			
Sierra		X				
Siskiyou	X		X			
Solano	X	X	X		X	X
Sonoma						
Stanislaus			X		X	
Sutter	X		X			
Tehama	X	X	X			
Trinity			X	X		X
Tulare			X			
Tuolumne		X	X			X
Ventura		X	X			X
Yolo	X	X	X		X	X
Yuba		X	X			
Total	25	27	53	6	13	11

*** 1 unknown county DA & 1 unknown county judge included in tabulations**

PROBATION SERVICES TASK FORCE

SURVEY RESULTS

Part 4: Appointments, Evaluation & Terms Of Chief Probation Officer (CPO)

Part 5: Your Opinion about the Appointment System

At their meeting on October 26-27, 2000, the Probation Services Task Force (PSTF) determined that the first items of the committees' focus will be Part 4: Appointments, Evaluation & Terms of CPO and Part 5: Your Opinion about the Appointment System. Alan M. Schuman, Corrections Management Consulting was asked to prepare a report on these for the PSTF meeting to be held on January 11-12, 2001, in San Francisco. Parts 1, 2, and 3 relate to agency staffing and workload, probation services, and goals and priorities of probation departments. These will be addressed in a separate report to be prepared for a future PSTF meeting.

A summary of the responses from Parts 4 and 5 from the Stakeholder Survey is included on pages [75](#) and [76](#).

The four stakeholder groups in each of the fifty-eight counties include Board of Supervisors (BOS)/County Executive or Administrative Officer (CEO/CAO), Court Presiding Judge (PJ)/Court Administrator (CA), Chief Probation Officer (CPO), and Probation Officer (PO). A profile of responses for Parts 4 and 5 indicate that:

- There were **93 responses from 54 counties**.
- There was at least one response from 93 percent of the counties surveyed.
- Thirty-four counties had at least two stakeholder responses.
- The mix of counties by size and location appears to be good.
- Eighteen counties responding have from one to five judges on the bench.
- Eighteen counties have from six to ten judges on the bench.
- Seven counties have eleven to twenty judges on the bench.

- Nine counties have more than twenty judges on the bench.
- One of the 55 counties was unidentifiable and another did not have a judicial count.

Narrative survey responses were consolidated and grouped into appropriate categories.

Part 4: Appointment, Evaluation & Term of Chief Probation Officer (CPO)

1. Who has the *legal authority* to appoint the CPO?

Respondents reported the following legal authority:

▪ Presiding judges	37
▪ Committee of judges	4
▪ Entire bench	11
▪ Board of supervisors	8
▪ Juvenile justice commission	1
▪ Presiding judge of juvenile court	2
▪ Juvenile court judge with consent by juvenile justice commission	1

Comment: Fifty-five of the 64 responses (86 %) report that the legal authority to appoint the CPO lies in the hands of the judiciary

2. *In practice*, if the CPO is appointed by a single entity or person, is that selection made through *formal* consultation or concurrence with any other entity or person?

Responses:

▪ Formal consultation	27
▪ Formal concurrence	16
▪ No formal consultation or concurrence	12

Comment: Forty-three of the 55 responses (78%) indicate some type of communication in the CPO selection process. Almost 50% use a more inclusive consultative approach. This indicates a good starting point for collaboration.

2a. If "Yes," With what entity or person does formal consultation or concurrence take place?

Responses:

- 20 counties use the Juvenile Justice Commission
 - alone (10)
 - with the bench (5)
 - with the bench and BOS/CAO (5)
- 7 counties use the full bench
- 6 counties use BOS/CAO and bench
- 2 counties use BOS/CAO
- 1 county uses a committee of judges

Comment: The Juvenile Justice Commission (JJC) plays a very significant role in this process. Fifty-five percent of the respondents utilize JJC's. JJC's could be key players in any future CPO selection criteria. It is not clear whether the composition of JJC's includes knowledgeable people who can address adult probation services. It is encouraging to note that at least 32 of the 54 counties responding (59%) include non-judicial personnel in the selection process of CPOs.

2b. Please describe briefly how this process works

Responses:

- 13 counties have the JJC jointly working with the bench. This includes JJC nominating and the judiciary appointing, or JJC concurring with judicial recommendation
- 4 counties have judges and BOS/CAO part of the interviewing process

- 2 counties have BOS approval of recommendations by the judiciary and JJC
- 1 county has BOS/CAO and judges consult
- 2 counties receive names from the county department of human resources and civil service
- 2 counties utilizes the entire bench
- 1 JJC & CAO representation

3. Does a formal process of evaluation of the CPO exist?

Responses:

- 36 counties have a formal process
- 19 counties do not have a formal process

Comment: Thirty-six of the 55 responses (65%) indicate a formal evaluation process. This means that *35% of the CPOs do not have a clear understanding of performance expectations. This is an issue PSTF should address.*

3a. Who has the authority for conducting the evaluation?

Responses:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|----|
| ▪ Board of Supervisors | 6 |
| ▪ CEO/CAO | 3 |
| ▪ Court Executive Officer | 4 |
| ▪ Court Presiding Judge | 23 |
| ▪ Juvenile Court Presiding Judge | 2 |
| ▪ Judges of consolidated courts | 1 |
| ▪ Judges & CAO | 1 |

Comment: Thirty of the 40 responses (75%) place the authority to conduct CPO evaluations with the judiciary. It is interesting to note that the executive branch of government conducts approximately 25% of the evaluations. Yet, 86% responded that

judges have the appointing authority. This means that *in some counties the judges have placed the responsibility to evaluate CPO's into the hands of the executive branch of government. If the judiciary wants the responsibility to appoint CPO's, they are raising some questions by having the executive branch of government conduct the evaluation.*

3b. How often is a formal evaluation conducted?

Responses:

- | | |
|--|----|
| ▪ Once a year | 27 |
| ▪ Every two years | 2 |
| ▪ Including every 3 years, 7 years, periodic, request of CPO | 6 |

Comment: *Twenty-seven of the 35 jurisdictions (77%) with formal evaluations conduct them annually. The goal should be 100% for all CPO's throughout the state.*

3c. Please describe briefly the process of formal evaluation

Responses:

- Sixteen counties involve the executive branch of government and most frequently use county employee performance instruments. County evaluation procedures are the predominantly used formal evaluation process for CPO's.
- Five counties have evaluations initiated by the presiding judge.

Comment: This is an important issue that should be addressed. Although 75% of judges have formal responsibility to evaluate CPO's, only 24 % of the judiciary have devised their own evaluation system. *Evaluations should be designed to review the primary responsibilities and functions of the position holder. Judges or court executives should develop performance expectations for the CPO and devise the process for these evaluations.*

4. Does an informal process of evaluation of the CPO exist?

Responses:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| ▪ Informal process | 20 |
| ▪ Do not have an informal process | 33 |

4a. Who conducts the informal evaluation?

Responses:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|----|
| ▪ Court presiding judge | 13 |
| ▪ Board of supervisors | 4 |
| ▪ CEO or CAO | 3 |
| ▪ Court executive officer | 1 |
| ▪ Combination of judge, JJC, BOS | 1 |
| ▪ Other judges | 1 |

Comments: Fifteen of the 23 responses (64%) have the judicial branch, exclusively, conducting informal evaluations.

4b. How often is an informal evaluation conducted?

Responses:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| ▪ As needed | 6 |
| ▪ Yearly | 4 |
| ▪ Daily work contacts | 1 |
| ▪ Weekly meetings with judiciary | 1 |
| ▪ Monthly | 1 |
| ▪ Periodically | 1 |
| ▪ Closed session with BOS | 1 |
| ▪ Three to five years | 1 |

Comment: The responses raise the question about the consistency and relevance of these "informal" evaluations. *The goal should be formal evaluations annually for all CPO positions whether conducted by the judiciary, executive branch of government, or a combination thereof.*

4c. Please describe briefly the process of informal evaluation

Responses:

- Twelve counties have numerous approaches to informal evaluations with judges, including "ongoing", "occasional", and "when appropriate"
- Four counties have the CPO meet with the BOS behind closed doors to discuss performance. In two of the counties, these informal evaluations are initiated at the request of the CPO
- In one county the judges, CAO and CPO work closely together

Comments: There is a range of responses to the process of informal evaluation. *Consistency between counties is an issue. The goal should be uniform formal evaluations statewide. This is particularly important because CPO's often move to CPO positions in other counties.*

5. Is the CPO appointed for a specific term, an "at will" employee, or only removed for cause?

Responses:

- | | |
|---------------------------------|----|
| ▪ Appointed for a specific term | 1 |
| ▪ "At will" | 35 |
| ▪ Only removed for cause | 26 |

Comments: Thirty-five of the 62 responses (56%) report that CPO's serve "at will". This points to the importance of formal evaluations. *Formal evaluations would reduce the perception of unwarranted CPO dismissals. Formal evaluations designed jointly*

between hiring authorities and CPO's would clarify performance expectations and build strong partnerships. The most constructive model would be removal with cause.

5a. If the CPO is appointed for a specific term, How long is that term?

Responses:

- One year term 1

6. Is there a formal process for removal of the CPO?

Responses:

- Formal process for removal 26
- No formal process for removal 25

6a. If "Yes," Who is responsible for the removal of the CPO?

Responses:

- Presiding judge 11
- Board of supervisors 4
- Juvenile court presiding judge 3
- Judges and JJC 3
- Superior court judges 1
- Majority of judges 1

Comments: Sixteen of the 23 responses (69%) report that the judiciary conducts the formal removal of the CPO. An additional 13% have the judiciary and JJC jointly conducting the process. The BOS conducts the CPO removal process in the remaining 18%.

6b. Please briefly describe the removal process

Responses:

- In 9 counties, the most predominant procedures are civil service and county department rules including Peace Officer Bill of Rights (POBR)
- In 7 counties, judges have the responsibility with cause
- In 4 counties, judges have the responsibility with cause and concurrence with JJC
- In 1 county, judges have progressive discipline
- In 1 county, presiding judge and bench meeting
- In 1 county, presiding judge and CEO jointly
- In 1 county, BOS in a closed meeting with the majority vote needed for action
- In 1 county, due process

Comments: Nine of the 25 county responses (36%) use written county standards and rules as guidelines. Seven (28%) are judicial responsibilities with cause. An additional four counties (16%) report judicial responsibilities with cause and concurrence by JJC.

7. Is there a process for disciplining the CPO?

Responses:

- | | |
|--|----|
| ▪ There is a process for disciplining the CPO | 26 |
| ▪ There is no process for disciplining the CPO | 25 |

7a. Please briefly describe the discipline process

Responses:

- 13 counties use a combination of code, Skelly Hearing, civil service, and POBR
- In 8 counties the judiciary decides, including progressive steps of discipline

- In 1 county the BOS uses salary increases and salary reductions as disciplinary procedures

Comments: Thirteen of the 22 responses (59%) use written county standards and rules as guidelines. Eight counties (36%) use judicial discretion. This discretion does not appear to be standardized from county to county. *A uniform disciplinary process should be incorporated as a part of the formal evaluation process. Regardless of the entity with the hiring and disciplining responsibility, uniformity among all 58 counties would be a positive improvement.*

8. In the past 10 years, has there been disagreement over the appointment, removal, or discipline of the CPO?

Responses:

- | | |
|---|----|
| ▪ No disagreement over the appointment of CPO | 41 |
| ▪ Disagreement over the appointment of CPO | 14 |

Comment: Forty-one of 55 (74%) indicated no disagreement over the appointment of the CPO. Twenty-six percent reporting disagreement over the appointment, removal or disciplining of CPO is a large percentage. Formal and consistent evaluations and disciplinary standards should considerably reduce that percentage.

8a. If "Yes," Please briefly describe how the disagreement was resolved

Responses:

- Responses reported few resolutions of disagreements
- One county had a disagreement in which the presiding judge determined it was not his responsibility to supervise the CPO. It was agreed that the CAO would perform the annual review of the CPO.
- Disagreement that the BOS should make the CPO appointment

- Unresolved disagreement that PO's should be part of the CPO screening and appointment committee
- Disagreement that the court should recruit and appoint CPO without BOS input
- One jurisdiction has a civil suit filed
- One jurisdiction has placed a CPO under investigation by CAO
- One CPO did not like judicial involvement and transferred to a state position
- Two responses noted that issues were not resolved but respondents did not state the nature of the problems

- **Comments:** The responses to this question illustrate some of the strained relationships between the judicial and executive branches of government existing in some of the counties. Many problems and concerns discussed in this survey can be resolved through recommendations being proposed to the PSTF.

Part 5: Your Opinion about the Appointment System

1. In your opinion, how well is the current appointment system working?

Responses:

- | | |
|---------------------------|----|
| ▪ Very well | 33 |
| ▪ Well | 14 |
| ▪ Neither well nor poorly | 10 |
| ▪ Poorly | 7 |
| ▪ Very poorly | 4 |

Comments: Thirty-three of the 68 responses (48%) give the current appointment system the highest possible rating. When you include the 14 or 20% that responded "well", 68% are very satisfied with the appointment system. This still leaves 16% under the

impression that the appointment system is working poorly and another 16% without strong opinions. *It is important to determine the underlying reasons and examine ways to address the negative impressions of the CPO appointment system.*

2. Please explain briefly why you believe the appointment system does or does not work.

Responses:

- 12 counties state the system works when judges involve the CEO/CAO and JJC in the interview process and work in a partnership mode
- 5 counties indicate judges should control the CPO appointment process
- 3 counties stated that the BOS pays and therefore should control the selection process
- 3 counties believe that judicial selection of the CPO results in no accountability to the county
- 1 county says that judges have narrow views, do not respond well to supervising the CPO, and seem to be concerned about the role of unions
- 1 county CAO expressed a strong desire to have over-site responsibilities of the probation department and the selection of the CPO
- 1 county states that the selection process by the judiciary does not work because neither the courts nor the state set the budget
- 1 response suggested that selection by judges causes conflicting priorities with BOS
- 1 response states that probation's independence from the courts results in fair interaction with the courts
- 1 county suggests that judges should select the CPO because services provided by probation are initiated by the local court
- 1 county states that the courts should select the CPO because funding comes from a variety of sources
- 1 respondent states that judges are needed to review CPO candidates' qualifications and experience

- 1 respondent suggests that state funding of probation would mean CPO selection by the judiciary
- 1 county CEO/CAO believes that judges should not be involved
- 1 county reports that judges who became state employees caused major conflict with local county officials especially around the issue of funding for construction and facilities

Comments: Twelve of the 34 (35%) of the respondents believe their system works effectively because of the partnership involving key stakeholders. The other 65% seem to express some dissatisfaction in how the current appointment system works. It is significant to note that 14 different responses were received giving suggestions about how the system *should* operate with the clear impression that the current system is not working as well as it could.

The process of inclusion described by eleven of the counties should be studied and modeled. The most successful approaches in the field of corrections have been incorporation of intermediate sanctions, specialized courts, and restorative justice models. All of these require a partnership with key stakeholders. The more the community stakeholders know about and are involved in the goals and objectives of probation, the more creative and effective the system will become. Regardless of who has the final appointment authority, the involvement of key community players in the selection process and, where appropriate, the evaluation process will be the most effective and inclusive approach.

3. Is there another type of appointment system that you believe would work better than the current system?

Responses:

- | | |
|---|----|
| ▪ Another appointment system that would work better | 17 |
| ▪ No changes in the appointment system | 33 |

Specific recommendations:

- 8 counties suggest selection by BOS would be a better selection system
- 3 counties indicated the courts should choose; 2 of the 3 recommended concurrence by the bench
- 2 counties recommend BOS appointment with court concurrence
- 1 county states the entity that appoints should have the fiscal responsibility
- 1 county suggests an election with term limits

Comment: Thirty-three of 50 responses (66%) suggested no changes in the appointment system. Seventeen (33%) recommend changes. The specific recommendations in almost all instances mirror the stakeholder position in the county. Judiciary responses indicate satisfaction when they are selecting. The same holds true of the executive branch of government.

4. We welcome your thoughts on how the appointment system could be improved.**Responses**

- 6 counties suggest that the courts should assume the costs of probation and make the CPO an employee of the court. CPO selection would be made by the judiciary.
- 5 counties suggest the BOS should select the CPO
- 3 responses suggest that CPO's should not be in the civil service system
- 2 responses suggest more BOS involvement with the judiciary on the selection process
- 2 counties suggested statewide control and funding of probation for public protection purposes
- 2 counties indicated CPO's must work together with the judiciary and the BOS
- 2 counties stated that the courts should appoint the CPO because of the importance of separation of power
- 2 counties recommend judicial appointment of the CPO with the concurrence of the BOS/CAO and the JJC

- 2 counties suggested the BOS hire with the concurrence of the judiciary
- 1 BOS states that the system is working well and the courts should appoint because of the closeness of the CPO to the judiciary
- 1 county states that the court is completely satisfied with their partnership approach with BOS
- 1 county says the BOS have a view of the bigger picture and should hire the CPO

Comments: Nine of the 29 (31%) responded that some combination of involvement between the BOS, judiciary, CPO, and JJC would result in an improved appointment system. Six counties (20%) believe that the court should assume the fiscal responsibility to fund probation and selecting the CPO. Almost the same number, five counties (17%) suggests the BOS selection of the CPO.

We continue to see a wide range of suggestions for CPO selection. These views continue to break along lines of funding responsibility. Generally, the BOS who fund the CPO positions want selection responsibility. The judiciary who work closely with the CPO and probation department believe that they are in the appropriate position to select the best-qualified CPO. A reoccurring theme in this survey suggests that, regardless of who makes the final CPO selection, some type of inclusive partnership results in a more unified county perception of how well the selection process works.

STAKEHOLDER SURVEY RESPONSES BY COUNTY

COUNTY	CEO/ CAO	JUDGES & COURT ADMIN.	CPO	PO	DISTRICT ATTNY.	PUBLIC DE- FENDER
Alameda			X			
Alpine	X	X	X			
Amador		X	X			
Butte						
Calaveras	X		X			
Colusa			X			
Contra Costa		X			X	
Del Norte	X		X			
El Dorado		X	X			
Fresno	X		X	X	X	X
Glenn			X			
Humboldt	X		X			
Imperial	X	X	X			
Inyo	X		X		X	
Kern	X	X	X		X	
Kings	X		X			
Lake	X		X			
Lassen			X			
Los Angeles	X	X			X	
Madera	X		X	X		
Marin				X		
Mariposa			X			
Mendicino			X			
Merced	X		X			
Modoc						
Mono		X	X			
Monterey			X			
Napa		X				
Nevada		X				
Orange		X	X			X
Placer	X	X	X			
Plumas	X		X			
Riverside			X			
Sacramento		X	X			
San Benito	X	X	X			
San Bernardino			X			
San Diego	X	X	X		X	
San Francisco			X		X	

San Joaquin			X			X
San Luis Obispo		X	X			
San Mateo						
Santa Barbara	X		X			
Santa Clara						X
Santa Cruz		X	X			
Shasta			X			
Sierra		X				
Siskiyou	X		X			
Solano	X	X	X		X	X
Sonoma						
Stanislaus			X			
Sutter			X			
Tehama	X	X	X			
Trinity			X	X		X
Tulare			X			
Tuolumne		X	X			X
Ventura						
Yolo		X	X			X
Yuba			X			